REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 19, 28, 32, and 34. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 19-20 and 22-35 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Examiner Objections - Claims

Claims 32 and 34 were objected to because of informalities. Again, the Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough review of the claims. The Applicant has amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner in order to correct the informalities. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 19-20, 22, 25, 27-28, and 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsu, et al. (US 2003/0227871) in view of Wu, et al. (US 6,707,790). The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection and in view of the above amendments and the following remarks, a favorable reconsideration is earnestly requested.

The Examiner agreed that the Hsu reference failed to expressly disclose a traffic envelope representing the upper bound of an ON-OFF traffic. However, the Examiner then stated that newly cited reference Wu disclosed an upper bound being derived from the traffic envelope in a QoS system of traffic flow (Wu, Col. 2, lines 1-15). In that regard, the Applicant submits that even though Wu may discuss a traffic envelope being the upper bound of a traffic rate, nothing in Wu discloses using traffic envelope representing the upper bound of an On-Off traffic in a packet level traffic parameter for reserving resources within a telecommunication network.

Unlike the present invention, the Wu reference instead uses the traffic envelope to estimate the distribution of the traffic flow and to determine whether a particular flow should be admitted into the network using the approximated rate variance. Accordingly,

Appl. No. 10/596,615 Amdt. Dated September 24, 2009 Reply to Office action of July 27, 2009 Attorney Docket No. P18918-US1 EUS/GJ/P/09-6102

other than determining whether an admission control unit admits a particular data flow, the Wu reference fails to disclose "defining an object including descriptors of the desired Quality of Service (QoS), packet level traffic parameters characterizing the traffic envelope wherein said traffic envelope represents the upper bound of said On-Off traffic". Further in accordance with the teachings of the present invention, Wu likewise fails to disclose or teach the recited step of "reserving resources in the nodes along with the flow of transmission with the use of said object." Lastly, since Wu deals with admission control and Hsu deals with resource reservations, they are not analogous arts and one skilled in the art would not have used the estimated traffic flow being used in admission control as taught by Wu into the resource reservation as taught by Hsu.

Additionally, the Applicant once again submits that the Hsu reference fails to disclose or teach the step of defining an object including "sub-object of description of source statistics for a call admission control wherein said source statistics include distribution type and parameter of the distribution associated with said On-Off traffic." In that regard, the Examiner incorrectly stated that since a "RSVP reservation request, para 0035 [in Hsu], contains sender IP addresses (i.e. address pertaining to a protocol type, IP (info about type) and the sender's address is a parameter of the distribution of traffic since it is where data is sourced from", the Hsu reference disclosed the recited limitation. It is the Applicant's understanding that the Examiner is basically arguing that the IP address in a RSVP reservation request in Hsu is analogous to the recited "sourced statistics including distribution type and parameters of the distribution associated with said On-Off traffic." Even though an IP address is nothing more than the identity of the sender/receiver in a telecommunication network and cannot be used to represent distribution type and parameters of the distribution associated with a particular On-Off traffic, in order to more clearly and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant considers as his invention and to place the claims into allowance, the Applicant has further amended independent Claim 19 to now recite:

"said sub-object of description of source statistics for a call admission control wherein said source statistics include distribution type and parameters representing the behavior of said ON-OFF traffic."

Appl. No. 10/596,615 Amdt. Dated September 24, 2009 Reply to Office action of July 27, 2009 Attorney Docket No. P18918-US1 EUS/GJ/P/09-6102

Since currently pending Claim 19 now recites that the 'source statistics include distribution type and parameters representing the behavior of said ON-OFF traffic," the Applicant respectfully submits that IP addresses included in a RSVP reservation request as disclosed in HSU cannot be analogous to such recited limitations. In other words, the IP address included in the RSVP message cannot represent the behavior of the On-Off traffic and nothing in Hsu discloses or teaches the recited source statistics which includes distribution type and parameters representing the behavior of the On-Off traffic. As a result, the Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 19 and its dependent claims are now in condition for allowance. Independent Claims 28 and 32 likewise now recite similar limitations and are in condition for allowance along with their respective dependent claims.

Appl. No. 10/596,615 Amdt. Dated September 24, 2009 Reply to Office action of July 27, 2009 Attorney Docket No. P18918-US1 EUS/GJ/P/09-6102

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

n C. Han

Registration No. 41,403

Date: September 24, 2009

Ericsson Inc. 6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11 Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-7686 john.han@ericsson.com